



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

**BIGAMY—COMMON LAW MARRIAGE.**—While defendant had a lawful wife living, he contracted a common law marriage with another woman, the latter acting in good faith. *Held*, that he is guilty of bigamy. *People v. Mendenhall* (Mich.), 78 N. W. 325.

The decision is in accordance with principle and authority. See *Heiler v. People* (Ill.), 47 Am. St. Rep. 228, and monographic note.

---

**TITLE TO REAL ESTATE—ESTOPPEL IN PAIS.**—In *Petit v. Flint etc. R. Co.* (Mich.), 78 N. W. 554, it is held that an estoppel *in pais* cannot be set up to defeat the legal title of the plaintiff in ejectment.

It seems to be well established in Virginia that estoppel *in pais* cannot operate as a conveyance of legal title to a freehold. See *Bolling v. Mayor*, 3 Rand. 563, 576; *Burtner v. Keran*, 24 Gratt. 42; *Suttle v. R. F. & P. R. Co.*, 76 Va. 284; *Nye v. Lovitt*, 92 Va. 710.

See Mr. Bishop's vigorous criticism of this doctrine, in Bish. Cont. 309.

---

**CONVERSION—AGENCY.**—Keepers of a tobacco salesroom, sold tobacco as agents for a consignor, receiving a commission for their services. There were liens on the tobacco, of which the agents had notice. *Held*, they are liable to the lienors for conversion. *White v. Boyd* (N. C.), 32 S. E. 495.

It is well settled that an agency is no defense to an action for the conversion of the property of a third person, howsoever innocent the agent may be. He cannot plead the authority of his principal, when the latter had none. *Mechem*, Ag. 181, 573; *Robinson v. Bird*, 158 Mass. 357 (35 Am. St. Rep. 495); *Newsum v. Newsum*, 1 Leigh, 86; cases collected in 2 Va. Law Reg. 551.

---

**MASTER AND SERVANT—ENTICING SERVANT—SEDUCTION.**—Plaintiff's declaration alleged that the defendant enticed and procured his daughter and servant to depart out of his service, *per quod servitium amisit*. Defendant demurred on the ground that the declaration failed to allege knowledge on part of the defendant that the daughter was the servant of the plaintiff. *Held*, on the authority of *Blake v. Lanyon*, 6 Term R. 221, that the objection is well taken. *Clark v. Clark* (N. J.), 42 Atl. 770. A second count in the same declaration for seducing the plaintiff's daughter and servant, was held sufficient, without the allegation of such knowledge on the part of the defendant. 2 Chitty, Pl. 644, note a; Smith, Mast. and S. \*175.

---

**RAILROADS—FAILURE TO USE AUTOMATIC COUPLERS, NEGLIGENCE PER SE.**—In *Troxler v. Southern Railway Co.* (N. C.), 32 S. E. 550, it is held that failure of a railroad company to equip its freight cars with automatic couplers, is negligence *per se*, and a brakeman injured in attempting to couple cars not so equipped, may maintain an action regardless of whether he was himself guilty of contributory negligence in making the coupling or not, if the use of automatic couplers would have prevented the possibility of the injury. The opinion, by Clark, J., abounds in statistics of accidents to railway employees. The doctrine is not a new one in North Carolina, but probably obtains in but few if in any of the other States, in advance of the recent Act of Congress on the subject.